

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,173	02/12/2004	Tadashi Sawayama	03500.013470.1	3762
5514	7590 01/03/2006		EXAM	INER
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			KACKAR, RAM N	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	L, NY 10112		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1763	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/776,173	SAWAYAMA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Ram N. Kackar	1763	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depend for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 N</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-11,28-34 and 39-44 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-34 and 39-44 is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	re withdrawn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document:  2. Certified copies of the priority document:  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document:  application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>09/294,367</u> . ed in this National Stage	
2) D Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 2/12/2004.	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1763

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-11 in the reply filed on 11/21/2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al (US 5819683).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al further teach that the trap could be of any configuration provided it can produce heat such as tungsten (Col 8 lines 12-20). Further Ikeda et al disclose the trap to comprise a double wall structure for cooling purpose.

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173 Page 3

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding temperature it is noted that the temperature is specific to decomposition of a particular gas and is therefore result effective parameter and could be optimized. However in a certain case temperature of 500 C is disclosed (Col 1 line55-58).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683).

As discussed above, Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas. Further temperature is specific to decomposition of a particular gas and is therefore result effective parameter and could be optimized.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Pang et al (US 6194628).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing apparatus to be a plasma CVD apparatus.

Since the process of exhaust gas treatment depends only upon the gas and not where it came from the disclosed process of Ikeda et al read on the claim.

However, Pang et al disclose treatment of exhaust gas from a vacuum processing apparatus for Plasma CVD (Abstract, Fig 2 and Fig 3).

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for an apparatus with plasma CVD would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Shingo Murakami (US 4901668).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing apparatus to be a photo CVD apparatus.

Since the process of exhaust gas treatment depends only upon the gas and not where it came from the disclosed process of Ikeda et al read on the claim.

However, Murakami discloses treatment of exhaust gas from a vacuum processing apparatus for photo CVD (Abstract and Fig 1).

Art Unit: 1763

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for an apparatus with photo CVD would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

8. Claim 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Yoshikazu Kikuchi (JP 63200820).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing process to comprise silicon.

Yoshikazu Kikuchi discloses an exhaust treatment process treating silicon-containing gas to trap material like SiO2 (Abstract).

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for a silicon containing gas would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

9. Claims 1- 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry et al (US 4746500) in view of LePetitcorps (US 5571561).

Parry et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus (Abstract) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas (Fig 1 and 2).

Parry et al do not disclose the filament to contain tungsten.

However tungsten has been known as a material of heating filaments for a long time.

LePetitcorps discloses a CVD apparatus where a filament containing tungsten is heated to deposit a material on the filament (Abstract and Fig 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use tungsten in the filament of Parry et al in order to heat the filament for trapping action.

Regarding temperature it is noted that the temperature is specific to decomposition of a particular gas and is therefore result effective parameter and could be optimized. However in a certain case temperature above 1000 C is disclosed (Parry et al - Col 2 line 30-35).

#### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Exhaust gas treatment using hot trap is further disclosed by Atsuji Matsuwaka (JP 60001827).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N. Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571 272 1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173 Page 7

Art Unit: 1763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ram Kackar

Primary Examiner AU 1763